

JAMES CURT BOHLING, Acting Chief  
D. HUNTER SMITH, Trial Attorney  
Money Laundering and Asset Recovery Section  
Criminal Division  
United States Department of Justice  
1400 New York Avenue NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
Telephone: (202) 355-5705  
Email: David.H.Smith@usdoj.gov

E. MARTIN ESTRADA  
United States Attorney  
SCOTT M. GARRINGER  
Assistant United States Attorney  
Chief, Criminal Division  
JONATHAN GALATZAN  
Assistant United States Attorney  
Chief, Asset Forfeiture Section  
MAXWELL COLL (Cal. Bar No. 312651)  
Assistant United States Attorney  
312 North Spring Street  
Los Angeles, California 90012  
Telephone: (213) 894-1785  
Facsimile: (213) 894-0142  
E-mail: Maxwell.Coll@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
WESTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
REAL PROPERTY IN LOS ANGELES,  
CALIFORNIA,  
  
Defendant.

No. 2:22-cv-02902-JLS-PDx

PLAINTIFF UNITED STATES OF  
AMERICA'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND  
MOTION FOR AN ORDER TO STAY THIS  
CIVIL FORFEITURE PROCEEDING;  
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND  
AUTHORITIES; DECLARATION OF  
AUSA MAXWELL COLL

[Filed Contemporaneously With  
Application Pursuant To 18 U.S.C.  
§ 981(g) (5) and Local Rule 79-6 To  
File Or Lodge In Camera Non-Public  
Declaration In Support Of Motion]

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on October 28, 2022 at 10:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in the courtroom of the Honorable Josephine L. Staton, United States District Court, Courtroom 8A, First Street U.S. Courthouse, 350 West 1st St., Los Angeles, CA 90012, plaintiff United States of America ("the United States") will and hereby does move, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 981(g)(1) (i.e., the mandatory stay statute) and the Court's inherent power, for an order to stay this action pending the resolution of a related federal criminal investigation. This motion is made following the conference of counsel pursuant to Local Rule 7-3 which took place on September 16, 2022 (see Coll Decl. ¶ 2) and is made on the grounds that proceeding with civil discovery in this case will adversely affect the ability of the United States to conduct a related federal criminal investigation and the prosecution of related criminal cases in the Republic of Armenia.

This motion is based upon this notice of motion and motion; the attached memorandum of points and authorities and declaration of Maxwell Coll; the non-public declaration submitted in camera and under seal in support of plaintiff's motion for an order to stay this civil forfeiture proceeding and the proposed order granting the motion (lodged under separate cover); all pleadings and papers on

//

//

//

//

//

//

1 file in this action; and such further matters as may be presented at  
2 any hearing on this Motion, and matters of which the Court may take  
3 notice.

4 Dated: September 23, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

5 JAMES CURT BOHLING, Acting Chief  
6 Money Laundering and Asset  
7 Recovery Section, Criminal  
8 Division  
United States Department of  
Justice

9 /s/ D. Hunter Smith  
10 D. HUNTER SMITH, Trial Attorney

11 E. MARTIN ESTRADA  
United States Attorney  
12 SCOTT M. GARRINGER  
Assistant United States Attorney  
13 Chief, Criminal Division  
JONATHAN GALATZAN  
14 Assistant United States Attorney  
Chief, Asset Forfeiture Section

15 /s/ Maxwell Coll  
16 MAXWELL COLL  
17 Assistant United States Attorney  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
18 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	LEGAL STANDARD.....	1
III.	BACKGROUND.....	4
IV.	ARGUMENT.....	6
A.	A Stay Is Warranted Because Proceeding With Civil Discovery Would Jeopardize Pending Criminal Investigations And Prosecutions.....	6
B.	The Criminal Investigations And Prosecutions Are Related To The Present Civil Forfeiture Action.....	12
V.	CONCLUSION.....	12

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASESPAGE (S)

<u>United States v. All Funds Deposited in Account No. 200008524845,</u>	
162 F. Supp. 2d 1325 (D. Wyo. 2001) .....	2
<u>United States v. One Assortment of 73 Firearms,</u>	
352 F. Supp. 2d 2 (D. Me. 2005) .....	3, 7
<u>United States v. One 2008 Audi R8 Coupe Quattro,</u>	
866 F. Supp. 2d 1180 (C.D. Cal 2011) .....	3
<u>United States v. \$600,980.00 in Currency,</u>	
2022 WL 2284934 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 8, 2022) .....	3
<u>United States v. \$1,026,781.61 in United States Currency,</u>	
2013 WL 4714188 (C.D. Cal. July 29, 2013) .....	3
<u>United States v. Various Vehicles, Funds and Real Properties,</u>	
2012 WL 4050829 (D.S.C. Sept. 13, 2012) .....	3
<u>United States v. 3039.375 Pounds of Copper Coins,</u>	
2008 WL 4681779 (W.D.N.C. Oct. 21, 2008) .....	3
<u>United States v. Real Prop. Located at 6415 N. Harrison Ave.,</u>	
2012 WL 4364076 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 21, 2012) .....	3, 9
<u>United States v. Real Prop. Located at 6107 Hogg Rd.,</u>	
2015 WL 13656951 (D. Idaho Mar. 11, 2015) .....	3, 4
<u>United States v. Real Prop. &amp; Improvements Located at 10 Table Bluff Rd.,</u>	
2007 WL 911849 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 23, 2007) .....	4, 7, 8
<u>United States v. \$4,480,466.16.,</u>	
2019 WL 459645 (N.D. Tex. Feb. 6, 2019) .....	4
<u>United States v. Contents of Nationwide Life Ins. Annuity Account,</u>	
2007 WL 682530 (S.D. Ohio Mar. 1, 2007) .....	8
<u>United States v. VIN: WP1AD2A26DLA72280,</u>	
2014 WL 289379 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 27, 2014) .....	8
<u>United States v. All Funds on Deposit in Suntrust Bank Account Number XXXXXXXXX8359,</u>	
456 F. Supp. 2d 64 (D.D.C. 2006) .....	8

1	<u>United States v. All Funds on Deposit in Business Marketing Account,</u>	
2	319 F. Supp. 2d 290 (E.D.N.Y. 2004) .....	8
3	<u>United States v. One Honda Aircraft,</u>	
4	No. 8:19-CV-1988-JVS-KES (C.D. Cal. July 30, 2020) .....	9
5	<u>United States v. 2009 Dodge Challenger,</u>	
6	2011 WL 6000790 (D. Or. 2011) .....	9
7	<u>United States v. \$247,052.54,</u>	
8	2007 WL 2009799 (N.D. Cal. Jul. 6, 2007) .....	9
9	<u>United States v. \$2,067,437.08 in U.S. Currency,</u>	
10	2008 WL 238514 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 28, 2008) .....	10
11	<u>Leyva v. Certified Grocers of California, Ltd.,</u>	
12	593 F.2d 857-64 (9th Cir. 1979) .....	11
13	<u>Neuchatel Swiss Gen. Ins. Co. v. Lufthansa Airlines,</u>	
14	925 F.2d 1193 (9th Cir. 1991) .....	11, 12
15	<u>Chambers v. NASCO, Inc.,</u>	
16	501 U.S. 32 (1991) .....	12
17	<u>Landis v. North American Co.,</u>	
18	299 U.S. 248 (1936) .....	12
19	<u>Wallace v. Kato,</u>	
20	549 U.S. 384 (2007) .....	12
21	<u>Wolf of Wall Street" Motion Picture,</u>	
22	2017 WL 8230168 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 13, 2017) (1) .....	13
23	<b><u>STATUTES AND RULES</u></b>	
24	18 U.S.C. § 981(g) .....	1, 9, 11, 12
25	18 U.S.C. § 981(g) (1) .....	passim
26	18 U.S.C. § 981(g) (4) .....	4, 13
27	18 U.S.C. § 981(g) (5) .....	3, 4
28	Rule G(6) (a) .....	5
	Fed. R. Crim. P. 16 .....	7, 8

## MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

### I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff United States of America ("United States" or "the government") respectfully submits this memorandum of points and authorities in support of its motion to stay this action pursuant to the mandatory stay provisions of 18 U.S.C. § 981(g) and the Court's inherent power. The United States seeks to stay this action pending the resolution of a related criminal investigation in the United States and related prosecutions in the Republic of Armenia because proceeding with civil discovery in the instant action will adversely affect the related criminal investigation and proceedings. Under the proposed order lodged contemporaneously herewith, the United States would be required to report to the Court every 180 days regarding the status of the related criminal proceedings.

### II. LEGAL STANDARD

The statutory forfeiture scheme that governs this action explicitly contemplates the situation presented here—that is, a civil forfeiture proceeding that arises out of the same facts as ongoing criminal investigation(s). In such a situation, Section 981(g)(1) provides as follows:

"Upon the motion of the United States, the court ***shall*** stay the civil forfeiture proceeding if the court determines that civil discovery will adversely affect the ability of the Government to conduct a related criminal investigation or the prosecution of a related criminal case."

18 U.S.C. § 981(g)(1) (emphasis added).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Though the statute provides for a stay of the "proceeding," the United States seeks only a stay of discovery. The United States does not object to briefing, argument, and resolution of the pending Rule 12 dispositive motions.

1 Congress enacted the stay provision of Section 981(g) in 2000 as  
2 part of the Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform Act ("CAFRA"), but the use  
3 of stays in civil forfeiture cases to protect ongoing related  
4 criminal investigations had long been an element of federal  
5 forfeiture law. Indeed, Section 981(g) lowered the government's  
6 burden when seeking a stay, eliminating the prior "good cause"  
7 requirement, and explicitly extended stay authority to ongoing  
8 investigations in addition to ongoing prosecutions. See United  
9 States v. All Funds Deposited in Account No. 200008524845, 162 F.  
10 Supp. 2d 1325, 1330-31 (D. Wyo. 2001):

11 The standard for granting relief under the amended statute  
12 has also been changed by striking the words "for good cause  
13 shown" found in the former sections of the forfeiture law  
14 that establish the standard for granting stay relief. The  
15 new statute requires only that the court "determine[s] that  
16 civil discovery will adversely affect the ability of the  
Government to conduct a related criminal investigation for  
[sic] the prosecution of a related criminal case."

17 Thus, while cases granting stays under the prior statute's good cause  
18 requirement remain relevant under CAFRA, cases denying stays because  
19 good cause had not been shown are no longer good law.

20 The central question in determining the propriety of a stay  
21 under Section 981(g) (1) is whether discovery in the civil case "will  
22 subject the government's criminal investigation to early and broader  
23 civil discovery than would otherwise be possible" in the context of a  
24 criminal investigation or prosecution. United States v. One  
25 Assortment of 73 Firearms, 352 F. Supp. 2d 2, 4 (D. Me. 2005). For  
26 this reason, the government is not required to make a particularized  
27 showing of prejudice or specific harm. United States v. One 2008  
28 Audi R8 Coupe Quattro, 866 F. Supp. 2d 1180, 1184 (C.D. Cal 2011).  
Requiring such a showing may result in the very prejudice the statute



1 is designed to prevent. Id. Instead, the government need only show  
 2 that an adverse impact is **likely**, and that showing can be made by an  
 3 agent or government attorney with knowledge of the civil forfeiture  
 4 case and the ongoing criminal investigation in a sworn declaration.  
 5 18 U.S.C. § 981(g)(5); see also United States v. \$600,980.00 in U.S.  
 6 Currency, Case No. 2:21-cv-06965-RGK-MAR, 2022 WL 2284934 (C.D. Cal.  
 7 Mar. 8, 2022) (agent declaration); United States v. \$1,026,781.61 in  
 8 United States Currency, No. CV 09-4381, 2013 WL 4714188, \*1 (C.D.  
 9 Cal. July 29, 2013) (agent declaration); United States v. Various  
 10 Vehicles, Funds and Real Properties, No. 2:11-1528, 2012 WL 4050829,  
 11 \*2 (D.S.C. Sept. 13, 2012) (AUSA declaration). When the government  
 12 makes such a showing, the imposition of a stay is “automatic” based  
 13 on the mandatory language of the statute. United States v. 3039.375  
 14 Pounds of Copper Coins, No. 1:08-cv-230, 2008 WL 4681779, \*1  
 15 (W.D.N.C. Oct. 21, 2008).

16  
 17 Indeed, “courts have routinely issued Section 981(g)(1) stays on  
 18 the basis of the Government’s allegations of likely prejudice to the  
 19 criminal proceeding caused by the civil discovery.” United States v.  
 20 Real Prop. Located at 6415 N. Harrison Ave., No. 1:11-CV00304-BAM,  
 21 2012 WL 4364076, at \*3 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 21, 2012); see also One 2008  
 22 Audi R8 Coupe Quattro, 866 F. Supp. at 1184 (same); United States v.  
 23 Real Prop. Located at 6107 Hogg Rd., No. 1:11-CV-00300-CWD, 2015 WL  
 24 13656951, at \*2 (D. Idaho Mar. 11, 2015) (“Allegations of ‘**likely**  
 25 prejudice’ to the criminal proceeding are sufficient”) (emphasis in  
 26 original); United States v. Real Prop. & Improvements Located at 10  
 27 Table Bluff Rd., No. C 06-5256 SI, 2007 WL 911849, at \*2 (N.D. Cal.  
 28 Mar. 23, 2007) (granting stay where “civil discovery will likely

adversely affect the ability of the Government to conduct the related criminal investigation").

Whether a criminal investigation is "related" to a civil forfeiture case within the meaning of Section 981(g) is governed by Section 981(g)(4), which provides that:

In determining whether a criminal case or investigation is "related" to a civil forfeiture proceeding, the court shall consider the degree of similarity between the parties, witnesses, facts, and circumstances involved in the two proceedings, without requiring an identity with respect to any one or more factors.

As noted, the government is expressly authorized to submit declarations or other evidence ex parte to support stay requests under Section 981(g)(1). See 18 U.S.C. § 981(g)(5) ("In requesting a stay under paragraph (1), the Government may, in appropriate cases, submit evidence ex parte in order to avoid disclosing any matter that may adversely affect an ongoing criminal investigation or pending criminal trial."); United States v. \$4,480,466.16, No. 3:17-CV-2989-D, 2019 WL 459645, at \*3 (N.D. Tex. Feb. 6, 2019) ("A court may grant a stay based on ex parte affidavits or other documents demonstrating that civil discovery might threaten to reveal confidential informants or otherwise impair the criminal investigation.").

### III. BACKGROUND

The parties have not yet responded to merits discovery. On July 28, 2022, the United States served special interrogatories on Claimants Artyom Khachatryan, Guren Khachatryan, and WRH, Inc. (collectively, the "Khachatryan Claimants") under Rule G(6) of the Supplemental Rules for Admiralty or Maritime Claims and Asset Forfeiture Actions. Such discovery concerns "the claimant's identity and relationship to the defendant property," Rule G(6)(a), not the

1 merits of a case. On September 9, 2022, the Khachatryan Claimants  
2 provided responses, which objected to most of the interrogatories as  
3 outside the scope of Rule G(6) and were signed by counsel, not by  
4 claimants.<sup>2</sup>

5 On July 29, 2022, the Khachatryan Claimants served on the  
6 government requests for production of documents that seek to uncover  
7 the details of ongoing prosecutions in the Republic of Armenia  
8 ("Armenia") and the ongoing federal criminal investigation. See  
9 Declaration of AUSA Maxwell Coll ("Coll Decl."), Ex. A. The requests  
10 seek, among other things:

- 11 • All documents that tend to support or refute the  
12 allegations in the Complaint;
- 13 • All documents relating to any witnesses the Government has  
14 interviewed or otherwise may have discoverable information  
15 relevant in the above-captioned case, including any witness  
16 statements, notes, and FD-302(s) for all witnesses  
17 interviewed by the Government in this matter;
- 18 • All communications with foreign entities and law  
19 enforcement relating to this matter, including but not  
20 limited to, all formal MLAT requests the Government has  
21 sent to or received from the Armenian government and other  
22 countries, and all documents and communications involving  
23 foreign entities and individuals in connection with such  
24 MLAT requests;
- 25 • All documents the Government has provided to or received  
26 from Armenian law enforcement relating to this matter,  
27  
28

---

<sup>2</sup> The United States will meet and confer with the Khachatryan Claimants over their interrogatory responses.

including any document that tends to support or refute the allegations and claims in the Complaint or contains inculpatory or exculpatory information; and

- All documents the Government has produced to, or received from, any other party or third party in connection with a subpoena or request for documents or information in the above-captioned matter.

Coll Decl. Ex. A (claimant's first request for production of documents ["RFP"] Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 7). The United States is responding to these requests today by filing objections that such discovery is premature until, at the earliest, the Court's resolution of this motion.

#### IV. ARGUMENT

##### A. A Stay Is Warranted Because Proceeding With Civil Discovery Would Jeopardize Pending Criminal Investigations And Prosecutions.

This Court should stay civil discovery pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 981(g) and its inherent powers.

**First**, the United States has requested permission to submit a non-public declaration in camera and under seal in support of its stay request that relates to its ongoing criminal investigation. As described in the ex parte declaration of Federal Bureau of Investigation ("FBI") Special Agent Mark Newhouse, there is an open U.S. criminal investigation related to the allegations in this civil forfeiture case. As described in that sealed declaration, proceeding with civil discovery in this case would likely jeopardize that criminal investigation by, among other things, causing targets of the investigation to change channels for moving illicit funds, and by potentially causing the subjects to destroy or conceal evidence.

1       **Second**, even without considering the evidence submitted under  
2 seal, a stay is warranted. If this action is not stayed, all  
3 claimants in the case will have the ability to pursue civil  
4 discovery. During federal criminal investigations, however, subjects  
5 are not entitled to take discovery. Further, even when a criminal  
6 case is filed, a criminal defendant's ability to take discovery is  
7 circumscribed. See Fed. R. Crim. P. 16 (providing only for document  
8 requests, not interrogatories or depositions, and also that most  
9 case-related "internal government documents" are, with limited  
10 exceptions, "not subject to disclosure").

11       Because proceeding with civil discovery would subject the  
12 government to broader discovery than it would be subject to in a  
13 criminal proceeding, and permit claimants and other third parties to  
14 obtain discovery earlier than they otherwise would be entitled to  
15 receive it in the criminal proceeding, a stay under the mandatory  
16 stay provisions of 18 U.S.C. § 981(g) is warranted. See, e.g., One  
17 Assortment of Seventy-Three Firearms, 352 F. Supp. 2d at 4 (a stay  
18 under 18 U.S.C. § 981(g) is appropriate where civil discovery will  
19 subject the related criminal investigation "to early and broader  
20 civil discovery than would otherwise be possible in the context of  
21 the criminal proceeding"); Real Property and Improvements Located At  
22 10 Table Bluff Road, 2007 WL 911849 at \*2 (stay must be granted if  
23 civil discovery will subject the Government to broader and earlier  
24 discovery than would occur in a criminal case); United States v.  
25 Contents of Nationwide Life Ins. Annuity Account, 2007 WL 682530, \*1  
26 (S.D. Ohio Mar. 1, 2007) ("As the government correctly argues, the  
27 Court is also very concerned about [d]efendants in the criminal case  
28 using this civil case as a back door method to obtain discovery  
outside the scope of Fed. R. Crim. P. 16").

1 Further, the government would likely suffer prejudice if civil  
2 discovery is allowed to proceed because the government would be  
3 required to expose its strategy and evidence in the criminal  
4 investigation, and documents related to asset tracing and witness  
5 interviews. See, e.g., United States v. VIN: WP1AD2A26DLA72280, 2014  
6 WL 289379, \*2 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 27, 2014) (stay granted because  
7 discovery of the identities of the witnesses in the civil case would  
8 jeopardize the criminal investigation); United States v. All Funds on  
9 Deposit in Suntrust Bank Account Number XXXXXXXXX8359, 456 F. Supp.  
10 2d 64, 66 (D.D.C. 2006) (granting motion for a stay because discovery  
11 in civil forfeiture case would adversely affect the criminal  
12 investigation because the discovery "could compromise any existing  
13 confidential informants and/or interfere with the Government's  
14 ability to obtain confidential information from others"); United  
15 States v. All Funds on Deposit in Business Marketing Account, 319 F.  
16 Supp. 2d 290, 294 (E.D.N.Y. 2004) ("The court is satisfied that  
17 information routinely ordered disclosed in civil matters would  
18 compromise the identity of confidential informants and cooperating  
19 witnesses. Under these circumstances, the court is required to stay  
20 this civil action. 18 U.S.C. § 981(g)(1)").

21 The risk of prejudice is especially acute where the ongoing  
22 federal criminal investigations or cases involve financial  
23 transactions. United States of America v. One Honda Aircraft  
24 (Michael J. Avenatti), No. 8:19-CV-1988 JVS (KESx), (C.D. Cal. July  
25 30, 2020); United States v. Real Prop. Located at 6415 N. Harrison  
26 Ave., Fresno Cnty., No. 1:11-CV-00304-BAM, 2012 WL 4364076, at \*3  
27 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 21, 2012) ("considering the complexity and frequency  
28 of financial transactions involved, complete evidence of the  
Government's tracing theories would run the risk of revealing

1 evidence Choi may use in his defense."); see also United States v.  
2 2009 Dodge Challenger, 2011 WL 6000790 (D. Or. 2011) ("given the  
3 number of people involved, and the complexity and amount of financial  
4 transactions involved, it is likely that discovery will need to take  
5 place before this court can determine if there is a genuine issue of  
6 material fact as to whether any of the seized funds or vehicles can  
7 be traced to the alleged fraud under 18 U.S.C. § 981"). As such, the  
8 plain language requires a stay. See 18 U.S.C. § 981(g)(1).

9  
10 Indeed, courts stay civil forfeiture cases even when claimants  
11 are willing to forego discovery. In United States v. \$247,052.54,  
12 2007 WL 2009799 (N.D. Cal. Jul. 6, 2007), for example, claimant Dobbs  
13 argued that because he was prepared to move for summary judgment  
14 without seeking any discovery in the civil forfeiture action, the  
15 action should not be stayed under 18 U.S.C. § 981(g) because  
16 discovery could not adversely affect the criminal prosecution against  
17 him. In rejecting Dobbs' argument and staying the action, the court  
18 noted that "Dobbs is not the only party that might want discovery in  
19 this action, however. The Government seeks and is entitled to  
20 conduct discovery." Id. at \*1 (citation omitted). The court also  
21 stated that proceeding with discovery "may have a serious adverse  
22 impact on the criminal case against Dobbs[]" and the court reasoned:

23 The factual allegations underlying the two cases are very  
24 similar. . . . To prove that the Defendants in this case  
25 are linked to the sale and distribution of marijuana, and  
26 therefore subject to forfeiture, the Government will have  
27 to prove many of the same facts it will need to prove in  
28 the criminal case. The risk of an adverse effect on the  
criminal case is clear. The Government asserts that it  
would need to depose certain witnesses-Edward Shield and  
Wade Trabue-to proceed on its forfeiture claims. Both are  
also witnesses with knowledge relevant to the criminal  
case, and deposing them now would allow Dobbs the  
opportunity to cross examine them in advance of trial,

1 potentially exposing the Government's strategy for trial,  
 2 or require them to divulge information related to the  
 3 criminal case. Dobbs simply ignores this concern. The  
 4 Government would also require testimonial declarations from  
 5 law enforcement officers, whose testimony will play a  
 6 central role in the criminal trial, creating additional  
 7 risks.

8 Id. at \*2.<sup>3</sup>

9 **Third**, there also are open foreign criminal prosecutions and  
 10 investigations that may be prejudiced if civil discovery proceeds.  
 11 Claimants Gurgen and Artyom Khachatryan have each been charged with  
 12 crimes in Armenia, including receiving bribes in violation of Article  
 13 311 of the Criminal Code of the Republic of Armenia. Compl. ¶ 6.  
 14 Claimant Sedrak Arustamyan has also been charged in Armenia with  
 15 paying bribes to Gagik Khachatryan (the father of Gurgen and Artyom),  
 16 in violation of Article 312 of the Criminal Code of the Republic of  
 17 Armenia. Compl. ¶ 7.

18 These ongoing criminal prosecutions are the basis for a stay:  
 19 first, section 981's mandatory stay provision applies if civil  
 20 discovery would "adversely affect the ability of the Government to  
 21 conduct a related criminal investigation or **the prosecution of a**  
 22 **related criminal case.**" 18 U.S.C. § 981(g) (emphasis added). While  
 23 this mandatory stay provision requires a *criminal investigation* to be  
 24 conducted by "the Government" (i.e., the United States government),  
 25 it also applies to any "prosecution of a related case"—regardless  
 26 whether it is by a state government, tribal government or a foreign

---

27 <sup>3</sup> Accord, United States v. \$2,067,437.08 in U.S. Currency, 2008  
 28 WL 238514, \*6 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 28, 2008) (stay ordered where claimant  
 contended that it could proceed with summary judgment motion without  
 discovery, government claimed it had to engage in ordinary civil  
 discovery and claimant acknowledged that it would be unduly  
 prejudiced if claimant was required to produce discovery while  
 criminal case was pending against claimant).



1 government, provided the United States moves for a stay. See 18  
2 U.S.C. § 981(g) ("Upon motion of the United States . . .").

3 Moreover, even if § 981(g)'s mandatory stay provision did not  
4 apply, this Court has discretionary, inherent authority to authorize  
5 a stay based on related foreign proceedings. See Leyva v. Certified  
6 Grocers of California, Ltd., 593 F.2d 857, 863-64 (9th Cir. 1979) (a  
7 "trial court may, with propriety, find it . . . the fairest course  
8 for the parties to enter a stay of an action before it, pending  
9 resolution of independent proceedings which bear upon the case"); see  
10 also Neuchatel Swiss Gen. Ins. Co. v. Lufthansa Airlines, 925 F.2d  
11 1193, 1195 (9th Cir. 1991) (for purposes of a stay, "the fact that  
12 the parallel proceedings are pending in a foreign jurisdiction rather  
13 than in a state court is immaterial").<sup>4</sup>

14  
15 Such a discretionary stay is particularly appropriate here,  
16 where discovery may require the government to provide "[a]ll  
17 documents the Government has provided to or received from Armenian  
18 law enforcement" to claimants who have fled the prosecutions filed by  
19 Armenian law enforcement in Armenian courts. This Court should not  
20 become a back door for access to foreign law enforcement documents  
21 and evidence that fugitive defendants have not received under those  
22 foreign jurisdictions' local rules of discovery. See Chambers v.  
23 NASCO, Inc., 501 U.S. 32, 44 (1991) (courts have inherent authority  
24 to protect their own "integrity").

25  
26  
27 <sup>4</sup> See also Landis v. North American Co., 299 U.S. 248, 254  
28 (1936) (district court's "power to stay proceedings is incidental to the power inherent in every court to control the disposition of the causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants"); Wallace v. Kato, 549 U.S. 384, 393-94 (2007) ("it is within the power of the district court, and in accord with common practice, to stay the civil action until the criminal case or the likelihood of a criminal case is ended").

**B. The Criminal Investigations And Prosecutions Are Related To The Present Civil Forfeiture Action.**

The United States criminal investigation and foreign criminal prosecutions are clearly related to the civil forfeiture action in light of the broad definition of "related criminal case" and "related criminal investigation" in 18 U.S.C. § 981(g). As noted supra, that definition makes clear that neither the parties nor the facts in the civil and criminal matters need be identical for the cases to be considered related. Instead, the court must analyze several factors, which are set forth in the disjunctive:

In determining whether a criminal case or investigation is "related" to a civil forfeiture proceeding, the court shall consider the degree of similarity between the parties, witnesses, facts, and circumstances involved in the two proceedings, without requiring an identity with respect to any one or more factors.

18 U.S.C. § 981(g)(4). In other words, 18 U.S.C. § 981(g)(4) indicates that the forfeiture case and criminal investigation should have some similarities but need not be identical in all aspects.

The civil forfeiture and foreign criminal cases are related under the broad statutory definition. The relationship between the domestic criminal investigation and the civil forfeiture complaint is set forth in the non-public declaration. And the relationship between the foreign criminal proceedings and the civil forfeiture complaint is obvious—there is no dispute that each claimant (aside from WRH, Inc.) has been charged in Armenia for alleged conduct directly related to the allegations in the civil forfeiture complaint.

**V. CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, the government respectfully requests that this case be stayed, with the government to file an ex parte

1 status report in 180 days (and, as necessary, every 180 days  
2 thereafter) as to the status of the related criminal proceedings.  
3 See United States v. "The Wolf of Wall Street" Motion Picture, No.  
4 CV165362, 2017 WL 8230168, at \*1 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 13, 2017) ("The  
5 motion for a stay [under Section 981(g)(1)] is GRANTED. The stay will  
6 continue until vacated by the Court, but the government is to provide  
7 status updates as to the investigation every 180 days to allow the  
8 Court to assess whether to continue the stay.").

9 Dated: September 23, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

10 JAMES CURT BOHLING, Acting Chief  
11 Money Laundering and Asset  
12 Recovery Section, Criminal  
13 Division  
14 United States Department of  
Justice

15 /s/ D. Hunter Smith  
D. HUNTER SMITH, Trial Attorney

16 E. MARTIN ESTRADA  
17 United States Attorney  
SCOTT M. GARRINGER  
18 Assistant United States Attorney  
Chief, Criminal Division  
19 JONATHAN GALATZAN  
20 Assistant United States Attorney  
Chief, Asset Forfeiture Section

21 /s/ Maxwell Coll  
22 MAXWELL COLL  
23 Assistant United States Attorney  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
24 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
25  
26  
27  
28